

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC
Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
Sean M. Blakely (SBN 264384)
sblakely@haineslawgroup.com
Liam A. Hall (SBN 358204)
lhall@haineslawgroup.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 292-2350
Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

05/27/2025

David W. Stryba, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: M. Arellanes Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JOSE LUIS CAMPOS, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TRICOLOR HOLDINGS, LLC., a Delaware
limited liability company; TRICOLOR
CALIFORNIA AUTO GROUP, LLC d.b.a.
GANAS AUTO, a Delaware limited liability
company; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25STCV07938

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

- (1) **FAILURE TO PAY ALL
OVERTIME WAGES (LABOR
CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194 and 1198);**
- (2) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
1194.2, 1197);**
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, and
558);**
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, and
558);**
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS
(LABOR CODE § 226 *et seq.*);**
- (6) **WAITING TIME PENALTIES
(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203);**
- (7) **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE
EMPLOYEES FOR NECESSARY
BUSINESS EXPENDITURES
(LABOR CODE §§ 2802 and 2804);**
- (8) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
PROF CODE § 17200 *et seq.*);**
- (9) **BREACH OF CONTRACT;
(CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE § 337);
and**

**(10) CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT (LABOR CODE §
2698 *et seq.*).**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE**

1 Plaintiff Jose Luis Campos (“Plaintiff”) hereby brings this First Amended Class and
2 Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants Tricolor Holdings, LLC, a
3 Delaware limited liability company; Tricolor California Auto Group, LLC, d.b.a Ganas Auto, a
4 Delaware limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive (collectively,
5 “Defendants”), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

6 **JURISDICTION**

7 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
8 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226 *et seq.*,
9 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, 2802, 2804,
10 California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, California Code of Civil Procedure §
11 337, and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 4 (“Wage Order 4”), in addition to
12 seeking declaratory relief and restitution. This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code
13 of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants’ violations of the California
14 Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

15 **VENUE**

16 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil
17 Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts and omissions complained of herein
18 occurred in Los Angeles County. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have an
19 agent or agents within Los Angeles County, and/or otherwise are found within Los Angeles
20 County, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

21 **PARTIES**

22 3. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein,
23 Plaintiff was, and currently is, a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods
24 applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-
25 exempt employee. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies and/or practices
26 complained of herein, lost money and/or property, and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed
27 to him by Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226 *et seq.*, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2,
28 1197, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, 2802, 2804, Business and Professions Code Section 17200 *et seq.*,

California Code of Civil Procedure § 337, and Wage Order 4, which sets employment standards for professional, technical, mechanical, and similar occupations.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the time period relevant to this action, Defendants did (and do) business as a vertically integrated automotive company managing subsidiary companies in the automotive service industry.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants were licensed to do business in California and were the employers of Plaintiff and of the members of the Classes (as defined in Paragraph 16).

6. Plaintiff does not know the true names, capacities, relationships, and/or the extent of participation of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, in the conduct alleged in this Complaint. For that reason, Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are sued under such fictitious names. Plaintiff prays for leave to amend this Complaint when their true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each fictitiously named Respondent is and was responsible in some way for the alleged wage-and-hour violations and other wrongful conduct that subjected Plaintiff and the Classes, as defined below, to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein. All references in this Complaint to “Defendants” shall be deemed to include all DOE Defendants.

7. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

8. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acted within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and the

Classes (as defined in Paragraph 16).

GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. Defendants operate as a vertically integrated automotive company managing subsidiary companies in the automotive service industry. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt “Express Technician” from approximately May 2021 until approximately March 2023. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt “Level C Technician” from approximately March 2023 until approximately March 26, 2024.

10. During Plaintiff’s employment with Defendants, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all hours worked, including (but not limited to) by requiring and/or permitting employees to work while off-the-clock, including during their off-duty rest and meal periods. This has resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being paid all required wages for all hours worked, including all minimum wages and overtime wages. Due to Defendants’ timekeeping policies/practices that fail to compensate for all hours worked, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all required minimum and overtime wages.

11. During Plaintiff’s employment with Defendants, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with all legally compliant meal periods due to Defendants’ meal period policies/practices, which have frequently resulted in late (commencing after the fifth hour of work), short (less than 30 minutes), and/or missed meal periods. Specifically, due to work demands, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were frequently unable to commence their meal periods until after the completion of five hours of work, and Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees’ meal periods were also cut short due to work demands. Plaintiff was also regularly interrupted with work demands during his meal periods and had to respond to emergent issues during his meal periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff was not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which he was entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff with the required meal period premium(s) for each workday there was a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintained no mechanism for the payment of meal period premium payments as

required by Labor Code § 226.7, in the event that a legally-compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

12. Defendants have also failed to authorize and permit all required rest periods for Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees. Specifically, Defendants have often failed to authorize and permit a 10-minute rest period for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof due to work demands imposed by Defendants. In addition, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees' rest periods were also frequently cut short due to work demands. Plaintiff was regularly interrupted with work demands during his rest periods and had to respond to emergent issues during his rest periods. On those occasions when Plaintiff was not authorized and permitted all legally required rest periods to which he was entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff with the required rest period premium for each workday in which he experienced a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, during at least a portion of the relevant time period, Defendants maintained no payroll code for paying rest period premiums under Labor Code § 226.7.

13. Defendants also failed to adequately reimburse Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all reasonable and necessary work expenditures, including, but not limited to, use of personal cellular phone for employment-related tasks. In addition, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees used their personal tools, such as a diagnostic vehicle scanner and a cooling system pressure tester, and other specialty tools, in the discharge of their work duties with Defendants. However, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for these business expenses.

14. As a result of Defendants' failure to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all minimum wages, overtime wages, and all meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and failed to issue accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements. As a further result of Defendants' failure to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all minimum wages, overtime wages, and all meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees all wages owed at the time of their separation of employment with Defendants.

1 15. Additionally, upon information and belief, Defendants had policies and/or
2 practices in place to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees with a \$5,000.00
3 retention bonus after completing an initial five months of employment. Despite Plaintiff and other
4 employees completing five months of employment and thereby earning the promised \$5,000.00
5 bonus, Defendants breached this contract with Plaintiff and other employees and failed to
6 compensate Plaintiff and other employees with this promised \$5,000.00 bonus. As a result,
7 Defendants have breached their contract and failed to pay Plaintiff and other non-exempt
8 employees all wages and compensation owed.

9 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

10 16. Class Definitions: Plaintiff brings this Complaint on behalf of himself and the
11 following Classes pursuant to Section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

- 12 a. The Overtime Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt
13 employees in California who worked more than 8.0 hours per day and/or 40.0
14 hours per week and were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or
15 practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the lawsuit
16 through the present.
- 17 b. The Minimum Wage Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
18 exempt employees in California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping
19 policies and/or practices, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of
20 the lawsuit through the present.
- 21 c. The Meal Period Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
22 exempt employees in California who worked at least one shift in excess of 5.0
23 hours during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the lawsuit through
24 the present.
- 25 d. The Rest Period Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
26 exempt employees in California who worked at least one shift of 3.5 hours or more,
27 during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the lawsuit through the
28 present.

e. The Wage Statement Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants during the one year immediately preceding the filing of the lawsuit through the present.

f. The Waiting Time Class consists of all members of the (i) Minimum Wage Class; (ii) Overtime Class; (iii) Meal Period Class; (iv) and/or Rest Period Class who have separated their employment with Defendants during the three years immediately preceding the filing of the lawsuit through the present.

g. The Employee Expense Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt employees who were not adequately reimbursed for reasonable and necessary expenditures in connection with their employment with Defendants, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the lawsuit through the present.

h. The Breach of Contract Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt employees who were promised a monetary bonus after five months of employment, during the four years immediately preceding the filing of the lawsuit through the present.

17. **Numerosity/Ascertainability:** The members of the Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the classes and subclasses are unknown to Plaintiff, at this time; however, it is estimated that the Class numbers are in excess of one hundred (100) individuals as to each class. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records.

18. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation, to:

i. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, §§ 510 and 1194 by requiring members of the Overtime Class to perform overtime work and not paying for said work in accordance with the

overtime laws of the State of California;

ii. Whether Defendants paid all minimum wages owed to members of the Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2 and 1197;

iii. Whether Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices resulted in the failure to properly compensate members of the Overtime Class and Minimum Wage Classes;

iv. Whether Defendants provided legally compliant meal periods to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;

v. Whether Defendants correctly paid meal period premium payments for non-compliant meal periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7;

vi. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted legally compliant rest periods to members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;

vii. Whether Defendants correctly paid rest period premium payments for non-compliant rest periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7;

viii. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226.

ix. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices for the timing and amount of payment of final wages to Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class at the time of their separation of employment were lawful;

x. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices regarding reasonable and necessary business expenditures resulted in the failure to properly reimburse members of the Employee Expense Class; and

xi. Whether Defendants' policies and/or practices regarding a monetary sign-on bonus for Plaintiff and members of the Breach of Contract Class resulted in a breach of contract.

19. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common

1 questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants’
2 uniform policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member including, but not
3 limited to, Defendants’ uniform timekeeping policies and/or practices, and meal and rest period
4 policies and/or practices. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions
5 concerning each individual class member’s showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as
6 to the amount of his or her damages.

7 20. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because
8 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statutes
9 of limitation applicable to each cause of action pled in this Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiff,
10 like the members of the Classes, was not properly paid minimum and overtime wages due to
11 Defendants’ timekeeping policies/practices, was not provided all required meal periods, was not
12 authorized and permitted to take all required rest periods, did not receive meal and rest period
13 premium wages for missed and/or non-compliant meal and rest periods, and was not issued
14 accurate itemized wage statements.

15 21. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary
16 steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover,
17 Plaintiff’s attorneys are ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the members of
18 the Classes and Plaintiff. Plaintiff’s attorneys have prosecuted and defended numerous wage-
19 and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously
20 prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

21 22. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves
22 an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in
23 California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from
24 exploitation by employers who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to
25 take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and
26 conditions of employment. The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff
27 and members of the Classes make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate
28 procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an

individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Moreover, requiring each member of the Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the individual members of the Classes are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto. As such, the Classes are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

23. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

24. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, which provides that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

25. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 4. Wage Order 4, § 3 requires an employer to pay an employee “one and one-half (1½) times the employee’s regular

rate of pay” for work in excess of 8 hours per workday and/or in excess of 40 hours of work in the workweek. Defendants caused Plaintiff to work overtime hours but did not compensate Plaintiff or members of the Overtime Class with one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for such hours.

26. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of overtime premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys’ fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 510, 1194, and 1198; and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

27. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

28. Wage Order 4, § 4 and California Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law. Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with attorneys’ fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid wages and interest accrued thereon.

29. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and Wage Order 4.

30. California Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an

1 amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

2 31. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged
3 herein, Plaintiff and the Minimum Wage Class have sustained economic damages including, but
4 not limited to, unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and are
5 entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief as
6 a result of Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 4.

7 32. The foregoing practices and policies are unlawful and create an entitlement to
8 recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Minimum Wage Class in a civil action for the unpaid
9 amount of minimum wages owing, including interest thereon, liquidated damages, statutory and
10 civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 558,
11 1194, 1197, and 1198, Wage Order 4, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

14 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

15 33. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

16 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
17 failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California,
18 including Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods
19 in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 4, § 11. Despite
20 Defendants' violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and members
21 of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of pay, in accordance with California
22 Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

23 35. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal
24 period violations pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and Wage Order 4, including interest
25 thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

3 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

4 36. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

5 37. Wage Order 4, § 12 and Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516 establish the right of
6 employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour
7 period worked, or major fraction thereof.

8 38. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members
9 of the Rest Period Class to take all required rest periods.

10 39. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and
11 members of the Rest Period Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums
12 owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit according
13 to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

14 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**

16 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

17 40. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

18 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
19 knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff
20 and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
21 that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of
22 pay and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, and the correct name of
23 the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*

24 42. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class
25 with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures
26 led to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest
27 period premium wages owed, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the
28 discrepancies in Defendants' reported data.

43. Defendants' failures create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class in a civil action for all damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*, including statutory penalties, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAITING TIME PENALTIES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

44. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

45. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-203, which require an employer to pay all wages immediately at the time of separation of employment in the event the employer discharges the employee, or the employee provides at least 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit. In the event the employee provides less than 72 hours of notice of their intent to quit, said employee's wages become due and payable not later than 72 hours upon said employee's last date of employment.

46. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all final wages due to them at their separation from employment, including minimum and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages.

47. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believed, and based thereon allege, that as a matter of uniform policy and practice, Defendants continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class all earned wages at the end of employment in a timely manner pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201-203.

48. Defendants' failure to pay all final wages was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203. Defendants' willful failure to timely pay Plaintiff and the members of the Waiting Time Class their earned wages upon separation from employment results in a continued payment of wages up to thirty days from the time the wages were due.

49. Therefore, Plaintiff and members of the Waiting Time Class are entitled to compensation pursuant to Labor Code § 203, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR
NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

**FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EMPLOYEES FOR
NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES
(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENDITURES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

50. Plaintiff re-allege and incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs.

51. Based on information and belief, Defendants required Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class to use their personal cellular phones and tools, and purchase their own supplies but failed to provide adequate reimbursement.

52. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2802, which states that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.”

53. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were subject to Labor Code § 2804, which states that, “[a]ny contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.”

54. As a proximate result of Defendants' policies and/or practices in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2804, and Wage Order 4, § 9, Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class were damaged in sums, which will be shown according to proof.

55. Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(c) for bringing this action.

56. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(b), any action brought for the reimbursement of necessary expenditures carries interest at the same rate as judgments in civil actions. Thus, Plaintiff and members of the Employee Expense Class are entitled to interest, which shall accrue from the date on which they incurred the necessary expenditure.

///

///

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

3 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

4 57. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

5 58. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful
6 business practices in California in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, by:
7 (a) failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum wages; (b)
8 failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages; (c) failing to
9 provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal periods to which they are
10 entitled, and/or failing to pay them meal period premium payments; (d) failing to authorize and
11 permit all required duty-free rest periods to Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class, and/or
12 failing to pay them rest period premiums payments; and/or (e) knowingly failing to furnish
13 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Class with all accurate and complete, itemized wage statements
14 in violation of Labor Code § 226.

15 59. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
16 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are
17 legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage
18 over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and
19 attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

20 60. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged
21 herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of
22 monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired
23 and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

24 61. The acts complained of herein occurred within the last four years immediately
25 preceding the filing of the Plaintiff's Complaint.

26 62. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this Complaint to
27 protect his interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf
28 of Defendants' current non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the

1 public interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs,
2 which he is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

3 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **BREACH OF CONTRACT**

5 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

6 63. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

7 64. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 entered into a written contract with Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for a monetary
9 bonus after completing the first five months of employment.

10 65. Plaintiff and members of the Breach of Contract Class have performed all
11 conditions, covenants, and promises required of him to be performed in accordance with the terms
12 and conditions of the written contract entered into with Defendants, as described herein.

13 66. Defendants were not excused from performing any of the conditions, covenants,
14 and promises required of them to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of
15 the written contract with Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees, nor was Defendants'
16 performance prevented by any law or ordinance, nor was Defendants' performance under the
17 written contract impractical, impossible or based upon any mistake.

18 67. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
19 breached the written contract described herein by failing to pay Plaintiff and other members of
20 the Breach of Contract Class for all services rendered and/or reimburse them for all expenses
21 incurred.

22 68. As a direct, legal and proximate result of Defendants' breach of this written
23 contract, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees have been damaged in an amount to be proven
24 at the time of trial, but which Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees allege exceeds the
25 jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

26 69. Plaintiff and other members of the Breach of Contract Class allege that pursuant
27 to California Civil Code § 3287, and they are entitled to recover prejudgment interest on the
28 damages he has sustained as a result of Defendants' breach of contract.

1

2

3

4

5

21

24

27

employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;

d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Rest Period Class, and other aggrieved employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.2, 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;

e. Failing to furnish Plaintiff, the Wage Statement Class, and other aggrieved employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;

f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Plaintiff, the Waiting Time Class, and other aggrieved employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203;

g. Failing to reimburse Plaintiff, the Employee Expense Class, and other aggrieved employees for all necessary work expenses incurred in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2804;

h. Failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and

i. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1198.

72. On March 19, 2025, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 71 (a)-(i). Now that sixty-five days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

73. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to represent himself and all Aggrieved Employees, as defined by Labor Code § 2699(c).

74. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and the interests of other aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198;
5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197;
6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226 *et. seq.*;
9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for statutory waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201- 203;
10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general, and special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2804;
11. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the

Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*;

12. Upon the Ninth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and special damages according to proof pursuant to Civil Code §§ 3300 and 3301;

13. Upon the Tenth Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the Labor Code violations identified in Paragraph 71 (a)-(i);

14. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.6 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

15. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§ 226, 1194, 2699(g), 2802(c), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

16. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: May 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

By:



Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff

///

1
2 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

3 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

4 Dated: May 27, 2025

5 Respectfully submitted,
6 HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

7 By:

8 

9 Paul K. Haines
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28